



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

petitioner, to be operative at once, but to take effect in enjoyment only on October 25. See *Ex parte Reno*, 66 Mo. 266. Or there may have been a present delivery in escrow to the warden. In either situation, the pardon, having once been delivered, would be irrevocable. *Ex parte Powell*, 73 Ala. 517; *Ex parte Reno*, *supra*. But there is a third possibility, that the pardon was sent to the warden as the governor's agent to hold it and deliver it on October 25. See *Lange v. Cullinan*, 205 Ill. 365, 68 N. E. 934. This is a possible view of the facts, and supports the court's decision. Assuming a valid delivery, the question remains whether the pardon would be void for mistake. Fraud, even that of a third party, invalidates a pardon. *Commonwealth v. Holloway*, 44 Pa. St. 210; *State v. Leak*, 5 Ind. 359; *contra*, *Knapp v. Thomas*, 39 Ohio St. 377. See 1 BISHOP, CRIMINAL LAW, 8 ed., §§ 905, 906. An English statute seems also to make pardons issued because of honest misrepresentation and mistake void. See 27 EDW. 3, st. 1, c. 2. See 4 BLACKSTONE, COMMENTARIES, 400. Whether that statute is part of the common law in this country is doubtful. See *Commonwealth v. Holloway*, *supra*, 219; *Knapp v. Thomas*, *supra*, 385. But some American cases show a tendency to treat mistake as vitiating, even in the absence of statute. See *State v. McIntire*, 1 Jones (N. C.), 1. But see *Ex parte Rice*, 72 Tex. Cr. R. 587, 162 S. W. 891. Undoubtedly fraud may be inferred from the fact of misinformation, if no other facts appear. *Rosson v. State*, 23 Tex. App. 287, 4 S. W. 897. However, it seems unlikely that American courts would go so far as to hold a pardon invalid because of mistake caused by the honest misrepresentation of a person totally unconnected in interest with the prisoner.

PAROL EVIDENCE RULE — CONSTRUCTION OF DOCUMENTS — SUPPLEMENTING THE MINUTES OF A CITY COUNCIL BY PAROL. — Plaintiff sues the defendant city for injuries sustained while attending a horse show on the street. The minutes of the council showed an application for permission to use a street for a horse show, but showed no action by the council. Parol evidence of such action was admitted by the trial court. *Held*, that this was error. *City of Mt. Vernon v. Alldridge*, 128 N. E. 934 (Ind.).

In proving the proceedings of public bodies, trustworthiness and certainty are best secured by the exclusion of all parol evidence and reliance solely upon the record. And when a record is required by statute, many courts exclude all parol evidence contradicting or extending it. *Dunn v. Cadiz*, 140 Ky. 217, 130 S. W. 1089; *Belleville v. Miller*, 257 Ill. 244, 100 N. E. 946. Nor is parol evidence admissible to vary the plain and clear language of the record. *Marshall v. Midland Valley R. Co.*, 96 Kan. 470, 152 Pac. 634; *Bailey v. Des Moines*, 158 Ia. 747, 138 N. W. 853. But parol evidence is admissible to explain ambiguous language in the record, in the absence of a statute making the record final. *Watts v. Levee District*, 164 Mo. App. 263, 145 S. W. 129; *Beattie v. Roberts*, 156 Ia. 575, 137 N. W. 1006. And liberal courts admit parol evidence to supplement the minutes of public bodies. *Gilmer v. School District*, 41 Okla. 12, 136 Pac. 1086; *Horning v. Canby*, 188 Pac. (Ore.) 700. *Contra*, *Kidson v. Bangor*, 99 Me. 139, 58 Atl. 900. Since every addition a litigant would urge is substantially a variation, this is going far. Yet when the statute merely directs the keeping of a record, rights of third parties should not be lost through the negligence of a city clerk. *Cf. Chicago R. Co. v. Pulnam*, 36 Kan. 121, 12 Pac. 593. *Contra*, *Lebanon Water Co. v. Lebanon*, 163 Mo. 254, 63 S. W. 811. Where the record is obviously incomplete or ambiguous, justice would seem to require the use of parol evidence to protect the interests of third parties.

PUBLIC OFFICERS — NATURE OF PUBLIC OFFICE — ACTION FOR DISMISSAL WITHOUT CAUSE. — The plaintiff contracted to serve five years as superin-